

**EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK DELIVERING POLICY ANALYSIS ON THE  
PERFORMANCE OF COHESION POLICY 2007-2013  
(CONTRACT 2009CE160AT075 - CAT039)**

**INCEPTION REPORT**

**15 FEBRUARY 2010**



Client Satisfaction  
Audit 2009

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>PRESENTATION OF THE TEAM .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>TASKS TO BE UNDERTAKEN AND PROPOSED APPROACH.....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	5
3.2	METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH .....	6
3.2.1	Overall approach .....	6
3.2.2	The approach to producing the reports .....	8
3.2.3	The organisation of the Expert Evaluation Network Meetings .....	15
3.3	ORGANISATION OF THE WORK, ALLOCATION OF TASKS AND TIMETABLE .....	17
3.3.1	Organisation and allocation of work .....	17
3.3.2	Summary of deliverables .....	22
3.3.3	Documents received from the Commission .....	23
<b>4</b>	<b>ANNEX 1 – TEMPLATE “POLICY PAPER ON INNOVATION”</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>ANNEX 2 – TEMPLATE “COUNTRY REPORT ON ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY”</b>	

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Expert Evaluation Network is the subject of a contract between DG REGIO and the partnership of Applica (Brussels) and Ismeri Europa (Rome), which was signed on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009. The kick-off meeting for the project was held in Brussels on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2010 where DG Regional Policy (DG REGIO hereafter) presented the context in which the project was developed and their main ideas regarding the role of the Network, work for the year and the expected results.

This inception report aims to demonstrate that the team has taken on board the messages presented at that meeting and understood the requirements of the work programme. It presents a brief presentation of the team and the experts and the approach to carry out each of the tasks envisaged, how the work will be divided between the various participants involved, and a summary timetable for the work.

## 2 PRESENTATION OF THE TEAM

The research will be directed jointly by **Terry Ward** of Applica and **Enrico Wolleb** of ISMERI Europa. They will be responsible for devising the analytical framework for ensuring the coherence of the project and for supervising the team of researchers as well as the network of national experts. They share a similar perspective on the importance of empirical analysis to throw light on the process of economic development and the problems faced by lagging parts of the EU and a similar commitment to the compilation and use of quantitative evidence to assess policy. They include:

**Andrea Naldini**, Director of Policy Analysis and Evaluation, ISMERI

**Lydia Greunz**, senior researcher, Applica

**Andrea Ciffolilli** holds a Doctorate in Economics and an MSc in Technology and Innovation Management from SPRU (Sussex University), ISMERI

**Marco Pompili**, an economist with a Masters degree in local development, ISMERI

**Sara Botti**, a junior economist with a Masters degree in Local development, Applica

The overall day-to-day management of the project and of the network will be the responsibility of **Loredana Sementini** (Applica) with the support of Applica's administrative staff.

**National experts**

Austria	Andreas Resch	Regional Consulting International GmbH
Belgium	Lydia Greunz	Applica
Bulgaria	Ruslan Stefanov	Center for the Study of Democracy
Czech Republic	Jiri Blazek	Charles University
Cyprus	Lena Tsipouri	University of Athens
Denmark	Peter Plougmann	New Insight
Estonia	Tarmo Kalvet	Tallinn University of Technology
Finland	Seppo Laakso	Urban Research
France	Michel Lacave	ITD-Eu
Germany	Oliver Schwab	IfS, Berlin
Greece	Lena Tsipouri	University of Athens
Hungary	Attila Bartha	Kopint-Tarki, Budapest
Ireland	Patrick Drudy	Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Dublin
Italy	Andrea Naldini	ISMERI
Latvia	Alf Vanags	Baltic International Centre for Economic Policy studies, Riga
Lithuania		
Luxemburg	Matthieu Lacave	ITD-Eu
Malta	Andrea Naldini	ISMERI
Netherlands	Lourens Broersma	University of Groningen
Poland	Grzegorz Gorzelak	Warsaw University
Portugal	Heitor Gomez	CEDRU, assistant director
Romania	Marina Ranga	Stanford University, research fellow
Slovakia	Karol Frank	Institute for Economic Research, Bratislava
Slovenia	Damjan Kavas	Institute for Economic Research, Ljubljana
Spain	Andres Faíña	University of Coruña
Sweden	Hans Sundwall	Independent expert
UK	Peter Tyler	St. Catherine's College, Cambridge University

## 3 TASKS TO BE UNDERTAKEN AND PROPOSED APPROACH

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

As the Tender Document makes clear, the establishment of an Expert Evaluation Network has the objective to deliver policy analysis and evidence on the performance of Cohesion Policy programmes, based on the monitoring and evaluation work underway in the Member States, analysing these results in the context of available statistical and policy research available.

To achieve this objective implies a need to compile summary details from a range of national and regional sources across the EU, to analyse the material compiled in a systematic way and to present the results of the analysis in an accessible and illuminating form so that they increase and widen understanding about the effects of Cohesion Policy in the debate on its future shape and role in the context of the broader discussions on the EU Budget after 2013.

The approach adopted to meeting the requirements set out in the Tender Document and establishing an effective Expert Evaluation Network (EEN) needs to start from an understanding of the rationale underlying the conduct of Cohesion Policy in the present programming period, the intended arrangements as regards evaluating the outcome and effects of policy and the role of the Commission in this respect.

#### **The Structural Funds regulations and evaluation**

As compared with the previous programming period, the regulations for the 2007–2013 period<sup>1</sup> set out a more flexible approach to evaluation. Instead of compulsory evaluations at pre-determined points during the programming period, Member States will carry out evaluations as and when it seems necessary or desirable to do so using approaches which they consider to be appropriate. This means that the frequency of evaluations and the way that they are carried out will vary between Member States, though the Commission has an important part to play in the process.

The Commission can encourage research into, and experimentation with, evaluation methods in various ways. Moreover, there are particular circumstances where Member States are obliged to carry out an evaluation, such as when significant divergences from targets come to light or when major operational changes in the programme are proposed. The Commission can also implement on-going strategic evaluations in areas of EU-wide interest or priority and, with agreement with Member States, on programmes which get into difficulty.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006.

The on-going process of evaluation is part of a wider system for following up and reporting on the pursuit of Cohesion Policy defined in the Regulation, which includes: the annual implementation reports (AIR) for each programme<sup>2</sup>, the national strategic reports in 2009 and 2012 and the Commission strategic reports in 2010 and 2013. The system is linked to similar arrangements established for monitoring progress in the pursuit of the Lisbon Strategy, which entails both national annual reports (National Reform Programme –NRP) and Commission annual reports presented to the Council.

## 3.2 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

### 3.2.1 OVERALL APPROACH

As the Tender Document specifies, three tasks are to be undertaken under this contract. The first is to produce for each Member State a policy paper<sup>3</sup> on innovation analysing the role of the Structural Funds in supporting innovation policy in the regions and countries and the performance of both the support provided and the policies themselves according to the evidence available, together with a synthesis report summarising the findings.

The second is to produce national reports on the achievements of Cohesion Policy in the 27 Member States, covering an assessment of physical and financial performance and an analysis of the evaluation evidence available in the Member States on the effects of Cohesion Policy, an analysis of this evidence in the context of economic developments in the Member State and regions concerned; and the identification of good examples of evaluations which have been carried out. This is coupled with the preparation of a report synthesising the main points to emerge from the national reports and drawing attention to the major economic trends as well as examples of good practice in evaluation.

The third task, which is required for the completion of the above two tasks but also in its own right, is to set up a network of national experts capable of producing the reports described above and organising two<sup>4</sup> meetings during the year both to discuss the national reports in some detail and to exchange views and information on relevant developments across the EU.

---

<sup>2</sup> Generally, the AIR is available 4–6 months after the end of the reference year. The 2008 AIR are the latest available at this stage.

<sup>3</sup> In future years, should the activity of an Expert Evaluation Network continue, the Commission will consider further themes under this task, e.g., rural/urban/local development, climate change, energy, major projects etc.

<sup>4</sup> It was agreed at the kick-off meeting to organise in addition to the two meetings envisaged by the contract, an additional initial meeting with the experts in order to clarify the nature of the work involved in the two tasks and the expectations of DG REGIO. Three meetings will therefore be organised during the course of the project.

## The network of experts

The experts concerned are at the centre of the project and its success in achieving the objectives set out in the Tender Document depends critically on their capabilities. Moreover, they have a potentially important role which extends beyond helping to produce the national reports required and which could extend beyond the duration of the project itself. Together, therefore, they could represent a valuable resource for providing summary details of the measures being taken across the EU to monitor and evaluate cohesion policy.

The selection of experts of the network is, accordingly, of key importance and one to which much consideration has been given. Starting from an initial list of people with the knowledge and skills required who could perform an ongoing role as indicated above, the final decision on the members forming the evaluation network has been taken after discussion with Commission officials at the kick off meeting of this project.

The experts each have a high degree of awareness of both economic and regional policy developments in their country. They also have some knowledge of the relevant officials in the authorities responsible for managing policy to contact. In addition, they will also need to contact other relevant people or organisations that have an understanding of the way that EU funding is being used and of the programmes being financed. These include evaluators and project promoters, in particular. A full list of meetings and interviews organised by the national experts will be included in the national papers and reports. An indicative number of interviews to be carried out in each country is set out below.

### Estimate of minimum number of interviews per country

BE	3-4
BG	3-4
CZ	3-4
DK	2-3
DE	5-6
EE	2
IE	2-3
GR	4-5
ES	5-6
FR	4-5
IT	5-6
CY	2
LV	2
LT	2
LU	2
HU	3-4
MT	2

---

NL	2-3
AT	2-3
PL	5-6
PT	4-5
RO	3-4
SI	2
SK	3-4
FI	2-3
SE	2-3
UK	4-5

### **The coordinating unit**

The task of the coordinating unit, or core team, set up is to direct and manage the activities of the network, to transmit to all members of the network the material received from DG REGIO, such as the planning and evaluation documents,<sup>5</sup> to define the scope and contents of the reports to be produced, as well as to draft synthesis reports summarising the findings of the national studies and highlighting the main points to emerge. The task also includes organising periodic meetings to discuss the output of the network and to go into particular aspects of developments in both policy and evaluation arrangements in some depth.

As well as designing the templates for the national studies the coordinating unit will provide support throughout the process of preparing the reports, starting from the compilation, processing and provision of relevant data available at EU-level, either in DG REGIO or in Eurostat. Members of the unit will also participate in key meetings with officials in Member States to discuss important aspects of the policy being pursued in relation both to Cohesion Policy and the methods implemented to assess this. Not least importantly, the coordinating unit will be the main point of contact with DG REGIO officials in the Evaluation Unit.

### **3.2.2 THE APPROACH TO PRODUCING THE REPORTS**

The approach to be followed in producing both the policy report on innovation and the national report is essentially the same, though the issues on which attention is focused differ. It consists of designing a template which covers the issues which need to be included and giving clear and precise instructions on the information required, the material to be used and the way in which this should be summarised as well as providing access to the main sources of information

---

<sup>5</sup> See list at the end of the report.



concerned and guidance on the people to interview in order to complete the information. It also consists of providing wherever possible the data to be included and interpreted, to the extent that they are available at the EU level – either in Eurostat or DG REGIO – in order to try to ensure that the data concerned and the analysis of them are, so far as possible, comparable across countries.

The design and provision of such a template, however, is only the start of the process. There needs to be regular interaction between the national expert and the core team ultimately responsible for the production of the national reports. This, in practice, means that the members of the core team need to be available for consultation, to respond to queries and give advice throughout the preparation process. It also means that the reports themselves need to go through a number of drafts before they are likely to be in an acceptable shape and meet the standard required. The preparation, therefore, involves the core team (at least two members) carefully reading the first draft of the report and commenting on it, with specific requests for revision, the inclusion of additional material or an extended, or modified, analysis of the material included. The same procedure is then applied to the second draft and, if necessary, to subsequent drafts until the report is in a suitable shape.

Once the content of the report is satisfactory, it will then be edited to try to ensure that the main points to emerge from the analysis are presented as clearly and informatively as possible. It is only at this stage that the report will be sent to DG REGIO for comment and only after the report has been revised where necessary to take account of the comments received that it will go to the relevant authorities in the Member State concerned to give their comments.

## **The preparation of the policy report on innovation**

### ***The issues to be covered***

Growth of knowledge, research, innovation and human capital was regarded as a priority when Cohesion Policy for the current programming period was being formulated. There were four main aims in this regard: to increase and better target investment in RTD, to facilitate innovation and promote entrepreneurship, to promote the information society for all and to improve access to finance. In accordance with these aims, the funding allocated in Convergence regions is estimated to amount to some 30% of the total in the EU15 and 20% in the EU12, while in Competitiveness and Employment regions, it amounts to around 40%. Moreover, estimates of expenditure are for an increase of over three times between the two programming periods.

Secondly, most EU-wide analysis of RTD and innovation policies have pointed to the need for different strategies between regions according to their stage of development and potential.

Assessments of policy need to reflect such differences. They also need to take account of the extent to which the strategy in place is directed at expanding the capacity both to innovate and to absorb innovations developed elsewhere, at establishing close links between research centres and businesses and at creating a critical mass, as well as the extent to which the strategy at the regional level is coherent with that at the national and EU-wide level. In addition, they need equally to consider how far indicators are available to monitor and evaluate the strategy in question and its results and wider effects.

A third issue concerns the coordination and coherence between national policies and regional strategies, aimed at increasing the potential for innovation of the universities, research centres and businesses located there.

The above aspects need to be reflected in the national policy studies and, accordingly, in the design of the template for carrying these out. In addition, there is equally a need to recognise that, in practice, at the time the national reports are being prepared, it is unlikely that much of the expenditure planned will actually have been carried out. This is especially the case given the prevailing economic circumstances and the extension of spending from the 2000–2006 budget, as well as the fact that the studies will be carried out relatively early in 2010 before the 2009 Annual Implementation Reports are due to be published. Relatively little information on the output of programmes or the results achieved is likely to be available. Accordingly, the main focus will need to be on the programming documents themselves and on the annual reports

It is important that the national experts complete the information contained there by covering evaluation evidence from national sources, including policy analysis, impact assessments<sup>6</sup> and interviews. The need is to distil what is said about the way policy is being implemented and the form which it is taking both at the national level and, more relevantly, in the regions receiving assistance.

In the light of the above, the policy paper, therefore, needs to focus on the aspects which can be regarded as being of key importance for the successful implementation of the programmes in question. These aspects are reflected in the suggested template set out below.

Each of the country experts will, therefore, prepare their paper by responding to the questions in the template on the basis of the information published in Annual Implementation Reports and other official documents, evaluation evidence available in the Member States including experience from previous planning periods and interviews.

---

<sup>6</sup> Experts are asked to transmit interesting evaluation evidence and policy analysis from their country including experiences from previous planning periods. The core team will centralise the literature and deliver it to DG REGIO.

***Production of a synthesis report on innovation policy***

The synthesis report will be produced by members of the coordinating unit. The structure of the report will broadly follow that of the national reports. The main objective will be to summarise the main findings in relation to the design and implementation of innovation policy, focusing on the regional dimension of this and how it varies between different types of region, on the support provided by the ERDF and how it fits in with national (or regional) policy. In so doing, it will seek to bring out the most important implications for the future conduct of policy and the principal issues which need to be tackled in as clear a way as possible.

It will also attempt to bring out the similarities and differences across countries, grouping where possible countries and regions in various ways according to the particular aspect considered – the nature of challenges in relation to strengthening innovation capacity, the policy objectives set, the form which innovation policy takes and its focus and so on.

In preparing the report, a conscious effort will be made to take advantage of the expertise on innovation within the network of experts by asking them to comment on drafts.

The contents of the synthesis report will, therefore, be as follows:

- Innovation policies in Member States and the regional dimension of these (distinguishing between the different types of regions and relating policy to needs and wider development objectives)
- The support for innovation policy provided by the ERDF, its focus and links with national and regional policies (indicating the main measures supported and relate these to the overall policy on innovation being pursued)
- The performance of innovation policy at regional level and the role of the ERDF in this regard (covering both financial aspects and tangible indicators of output and results)
- Conclusions and main challenges (identifying the main points to emerge from the country studies in relation to both the conduct of policy and the systems in place for monitoring and evaluating it).

**The preparation of national reports*****Issues to be covered***

The central aim of the national reports is to synthesis evidence on the performance of Cohesion Policy programmes (co-financed by ERDF and the Cohesion Fund), based on the monitoring and evaluation work underway in the Member States and to analyse and interpret the achievements in the context of economic trends within the Member States. This includes an analysis of the

progress in implementing the policy in relation to targets set or stated objectives and the expenditure incurred as compared with the funding allocated. There is equally an important need to review the effect of the present recession on the implementation of policy, on the objectives set and on the expenditure in the various policy areas. Since Eurostat data on regional GDP go up to 2007 only, there is a need if possible to obtain more recent data from national sources.

An additional issue to be addressed by the national reports is to gather and summarise evidence on the evaluations undertaken by the Member States to assess policy performance and to comment on the suitability and effectiveness of evaluation methods. The systems of monitoring and evaluating Cohesion Policy which Member States and regions have chosen to set up are, therefore, not only the means of assessing the conduct of policy and what it is achieving but also a focus of evaluation in their own right, to assess the capacity in the different countries for identifying, analysing and taking account of Cohesion Policy outcomes. A related aim of the national studies is equally to identify the kind of information likely to be available in the future for policy evaluation and the gaps that this leaves, as well as to comment on the relevance of the indicators developed and the meaningfulness of the targets set. A further aim is to identify examples of good practice in evaluation and to describe the methods adopted and the other key features which could potentially be taken up elsewhere.

In sum, the national reports need to cover:

- a synthesis and analysis of information coming from the 2009 Annual Implementation Reports including an assessment of physical performance (output, results, wider effects) and financial performance in relation to targets set and stated objectives
- an analysis and commentary on evaluation evidence available in the Member States including evaluations launched and produced in the 2007–2013 period as well as evaluations relating to 2000–2006 relevant for similar interventions and other research and evaluation evidence available within the Member States
- an analysis and interpretation of Cohesion Policy evidence in the context of economic trends within the Member States and
- identification of good practice in evaluation with an indication why (interesting method, good data etc.) and any important gaps in evaluation evidence.

These issues are addressed in the various sections of the draft template in Annex. The task of the national experts in each case is to draft the reports by responding to the questions included in the template on the basis of evaluation evidence available and the results of relevant studies carried out in the country in question as well as of information obtained by interviews with relevant officials and others who have an understanding of the way that Cohesion Policy is

being pursued and the outcomes in different policy areas. The last is important in order to obtain as up-to-date account as possible of developments.

Although the main aim of the national reports is to summarise the information in the official reports and obtainable from officials on the conduct and performance of policy in its various aspects, there is also a need to go beyond official statements at particular points to assess the appropriateness or suitability of policy in relation to the problems and challenges confronting different regions. While this is part of the task of the national experts, such assessments or reflections need to be clearly distinguished and supported so far as possible by empirical evidence or research findings.

### ***Production of a synthesis report on Cohesion Policy in Member States***

The synthesis report will be produced by members of the coordinating unit. The structure of the report will broadly follow that of the national reports. The main objective will be to bring out the main findings as regards both the pursuit of policy and its performance in different regions across the EU – and in particular in the different types of region receiving support under the three Objectives of Cohesion Policy.

In so doing, it will attempt to summarise the achievements of policy in different parts of the EU, insofar as they can be identified, focusing on those where hard evidence exists on the positive consequences of the measures supported. It will also seek to identify the main problems which have emerged in the implementation of policy and the underlying reasons for this, as well as the way that these problems are being tackled, or not as the case may be, and the implications of such problems for the conduct of policy (in terms of institutional arrangements as well as type of measure implemented).

A related aim will be to highlight the progress made across the EU in putting in place effective monitoring and evaluation systems and what these have produced in terms of results, as well as the way that these results have fed into the policy-making process and the effect they have had in this respect. In addition, the report will also draw attention to the difficulties of assessing the performance of Cohesion Policy and what it has achieved from the evidence available.

The synthesis will include, in addition, a few examples of good practice in evaluation to illustrate what can be achieved, from, if possible, a number of different countries and in different policy areas.

### **Draft outline**

The structure of the report will, therefore, be broadly as follows, though as in all aspects of the project, the final say on this will be decided in consultation with DG REGIO at the time, taking account of any important issues which arise in the meantime:

- The economic circumstances in which Cohesion Policy is being pursued across the EU and how they differ from those prevailing at the time the programmes were initially formulated (drawing attention to the effect of the global recession in particular)
- The focus of Cohesion Policy in the different types of region and policy areas and its consistency or otherwise with national, or regional, development policy (the objectives and priorities set and the main means identified for pursuing these)
- How policy is being implemented and the expenditure committed in relation to the initial allocation (highlighting the extent to which expenditure is in line with or falling being plans and the difficulties which have arisen in this regard)
- The performance of policy in different regions and in different policy areas (in terms of the output and results achieved insofar as they can be identified as well as in terms of the wider impact on regional development to the extent that any evidence exists)
- The progress made in evaluating Cohesion Policy across the EU and the form which they have taken outlining the main findings and features (types, coverage, methods) as well as drawing attention to the gaps which still exist and the plans for tackling these
- Examples of good practice in evaluation (from different Member States and in different policy areas)
- Conclusions and main challenges (identifying the main points to emerge from the country studies in relation to both the conduct of policy and the systems in place for monitoring and evaluating it). Based on the findings on main challenges, recommendation for topics to investigate in further policy papers will be formulated.

Under each head, an attempt will be made for presentational purposes to group countries with similar features or experiencing similar developments as a means of indicating the state of play so far as the pursuit of policy objectives and the capacity to assess progress in this regard are concerned. In addition, a clear separation will be made throughout between the experience in the different types of regions receiving support under the three Objectives.

#### **Method of synthesising the country reports**

The coordinating unit, or core team, will be responsible for producing the synthesis report of the country studies, as in the case of the synthesis report on innovation policy.

Members of the coordinating team will work together in identifying the main points which ought to be included in the synthesis report, the four main members of the team reading all of the country studies and making suggestions in this regard. A meeting will be held to discuss the reports and the points concerned (to which DG REGIO officials will be invited) and the task of preparing an initial draft of the various sections will be allocated to a team member. Drafts

will then be consolidated into a coherent report before being circulated for comment both to DG REGIO officials and to members of the expert network. A revised draft will then be prepared taking account of the various comments for circulation to the same people before for further comment, the process continuing if necessary until an acceptable version has been produced.

### 3.2.3 THE ORGANISATION OF THE EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK MEETINGS

Although the contract envisaged only two meetings of the expert network, it was agreed at the kick-off meeting that it would be useful to arrange an early additional meeting with the experts in order to clarify from the outset the nature of the work involved in the two tasks and the expectations of DG REGIO. Three meetings with the experts will therefore be organised during the course of the project.

#### First Expert evaluation network meeting – 5<sup>th</sup> March 2010

##### Agenda

Time	Activity
09:30–10:00	DG-REGIO intro and background to project
10:00–10:30	Presentation of work-programme, timetable, contribution from experts
10:30–11:00	Presentation and discussion of template for innovation papers
11:00–11:20	Coffee-break
11:20–12:20	Discussion of reports on innovation (cont'd)
12:20–13:00	Suggestions for interviews in Member States
13:00–14:00	Lunch break
14:00–16:00	Presentation and discussions of template for country reports
16:00–16:30	Summing up and next steps

#### Expert evaluation network meeting on innovation – 16<sup>th</sup> June 2010

The main focus of the second meeting will be on the key findings of the innovation papers and synthesis report. Some time, however, will be devoted in the afternoon to the progress made in relation to the country reports (Task 2) and any difficulties faced by the experts in carrying out the work.

**Provisional agenda**

Time	Activity
9.30–10.00	Welcome and introduction
10.00–10.30	Key findings of the synthesis report on innovation (Task 1)
10.30–11.00	Discussion
11.00–11.20	Coffee break
11.20–12.00	Discussion (con'd)
12.00–12.15	Systems/methods for monitoring and evaluating innovation policy at regional level (incl. examples of good practice)
12.15–13.00	Discussion
13.00–14.00	Lunch break
14.00–14.15	Main challenges for regional innovation policy across the EU
14.15–15.00	Discussion
15.00–16.30	Country reports (Task 2) – Progress so far, any problems encountered
16.30–16.45	Conclusions

**Expert evaluation network meeting on achievements of Cohesion Policy and evaluation – 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010**

The morning session will focus on the main findings of the draft synthesis report on the Cohesion Policy pursued across the EU in the different types of region, the way that policy has been affected by economic circumstances, especially the global recession, and what has been achieved. The afternoon session will be devoted to the main findings of the synthesis report in relation to monitoring and evaluation and a presentation of examples of good practice and what it involves.

**Provisional agenda**

Time	Activity
9.30–10.00	Welcome and introduction
10.00–10.15	Presentation of main findings of synthesis report on Cohesion Policy
10.15–11.00	Discussion
11.00–11.20	Coffee break



11.20-13.00	Discussion (cont'd)
13.00-14.00	Lunch break
14.00-14.15	Key messages from synthesis report in relation to monitoring and evaluation
14.15-15.15	Discussion
15.15-15.45	Presentation of example(s) of good practice
15.45-16.30	Discussion
16.30-16.45	Conclusions

### 3.3 ORGANISATION OF THE WORK, ALLOCATION OF TASKS AND TIMETABLE

#### 3.3.1 ORGANISATION AND ALLOCATION OF WORK

Work on the project will be directed by a coordinating unit, or core team, consisting of Terry Ward and Lydia Greunz of Applica and Enrico Wolleb and Andrea Naldini of ISMERI Europa. These will share responsibility between them for work on the individual tasks as indicated below. They will be supported by economists and researchers from their two respective organisations and by Loredana Sementini, who will be responsible for the day-to-day administrative management of the project to ensure that the work proceeds efficiently and on schedule and that administrative support is provided as necessary. Although each member of the core group will have responsibility for a particular task, they will follow closely the work undertaken by the others and will provide advice and comment throughout the process.

Terry Ward will be the principal project coordinator and will be the main point of contact with DG REGIO on scientific and technical issues. He will therefore be responsible for conveying the results of the work undertaken on the project and for relaying any comments and suggestions from the Commission to other members of the team. He will attend progress meetings with DG REGIO as envisaged in the Tender Document. Since he is based in Brussels, such meetings can be arranged at short notice as the need arises (and indeed could exceed the number envisaged if required). He will be accompanied by other members of team as necessary. He will also be the final editor of all published deliverables, ensuring consistency of presentation and uniformity of style.

## The three tasks to be undertaken

**Task 1** involves the coordination of 27 policy papers and the production of a synthesis report on the topic of innovation. The policy papers will be prepared by the national experts on the basis of common template provided by the coordinator and under the direction of Enrico Wolleb, who has long experience of undertaking comparative research on innovation issues and policies in EU Member States and regions. He will also be responsible for drafting the comparative synthesis report in consultation with the other members of the core team, as well as with DG REGIO officials. The final editing of the report will be undertaken by Terry Ward.

**Task 2** involves the coordination of the Country Reports on Achievements of Cohesion Policy and the production of a synthesis report. As for the innovation papers, the country reports will be prepared by the national experts on the basis of a common template under the joint responsibility of Lydia Greunz and Andrea Naldini, who together were responsible in 2008–2009 for the national reports prepared as part of the ex-post evaluation of the Structural Funds in the period 2000–2006 (WP1). They will be responsible for preparing the draft comparative synthesis report, which will be circulated widely for comment as indicated above. The preparation of the final draft of the report and its editing will be carried out by Terry Ward. He will also edit all the national reports.

Both **Tasks 2 and 3** require efficient coordination and regular communication between the core members of the team and between these and the national experts. The core members will coordinate the work involved in the preparation of these reports at every stage, starting with the design of a template or frame of reference (a draft of which is included below). In each case, the core team will be responsible for producing the final version of the individual country reports to ensure consistency and overall coherence.

**Task 3** involves the organisation of two Expert Evaluation Network Meetings, which will discuss the draft synthesis reports but also deepen the analysis. An early additional meeting with the experts was held the 5<sup>th</sup> of March in order to clarify from the outset the nature of the work involved in the two tasks and the expectations of DG REGIO. This task is the responsibility of Loredana Sementini, in cooperation with the core team and in consultation with DG REGIO.

### *Planning of Task 2*

Since Task 2 is at the centre of the project, it is useful to set out a time schedule of how it is intended to organise the work in some detail.

During February–March 2010, the core team will prepare and finalise the template of the country studies and launch the pilot report for Austria (for which a draft report should be finalised by end of May 2010 (instead of July 2010 as indicated in the Tender Document). At the

same time, the national experts will be asked to collect the documents available from national sources.

Once the pilot report is finished, the template will be adapted accordingly. Both documents will be transmitted to the national experts together with detailed guidelines.

Country studies will then be carried out from June 2010 and a draft version delivered to the core team at latest by the end of August. Comments and recommendations for revision and, where necessary, extension will be formulated by the core team as draft reports are received and sent to the national experts.

The synthesis report will be prepared on the basis of the draft versions of the country reports from the beginning of September and a draft version delivered to DG REGIO by mid-October. This will be discussed at both a Steering Committee meeting and at a meeting of the network of experts in November. Final versions of the country reports, in edited form, and the synthesis report will be prepared, taking account of the comments received at both meetings, and delivered to DG REGIO in December.

### **Overall coordination and management**

Efficient project management is critical to the success of the project.

Responsibility for this task will be shared by Terry Ward (scientific coordination) and Loredana Sementini (administrative coordination and day-to-day management),. They will be supported by other qualified Applica personnel to ensure that technical as well as administrative aspects of management support are carried out effectively.

**Proposed timetable**

The timetable set out below is based on the schedule for delivery of reports and for meetings agreed at the kick-off meeting. It is however subject to change with the expressed agreement of the two parties, as the work proceeds if it seems desirable to alter the schedule in order to achieve the ultimate objectives more effectively. The current timetable suggests bringing forward the delivery of the pilot country report Austria under Task 2, so as to allow more time for the national experts to complete their reports given that at present the task coincides with Summer holidays, though the availability of the AIR for 2009 constrains what is possible here.

Ta1  
Fina

**Project timeline**

Deliverable	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Kick-off meeting (1)	15/01											
Inception Report		15/2										
1 <sup>st</sup> Steering group meeting		23/2										
1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting of Evaluation Expert Network			5/3									
<b>Task 1</b>	<b>Draft Policy papers on Innovation</b>											
Template for policy papers		15/2										
Draft Policy papers on innovation (internal deadline)				30/4								
Progress meeting (2)					♦							
27 Policy papers and draft Synthesis report on innovation					28/5							
2 <sup>nd</sup> Steering group meeting						15/6						
2 <sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Evaluation Expert Network						16/6						
Finalised Policy papers and synthesis report							♦					
<b>Task 2</b>	<b>Country Reports on Achievements of Cohesion Policy</b>											
Template for country report			15/3									
Pilot country report					30/5							
Progress meeting (3)							♦					
Draft country reports (internal deadline)								30/8				
Draft country reports									30/9			
Progress meeting (4)										♦		
Draft synthesis report										15/10		
3 <sup>rd</sup> Steering group meeting											9/11	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting of Evaluation Expert Network											10/11	
Finalised country reports and Synthesis Report												17/12

*Note: The network meetings, Task 3, are integrated under Tasks 1 and 2*

**3.3.2 SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLES**

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Format</b>
1. <b>Inception report</b> , outlining the approach to all tasks and including templates and annotated contents of synthesis reports	EN	Electronic format (word)
2. <b>27 Policy papers on innovation</b>	EN	Hard copy and electronic format (word + pdf)
3. <b>Synthesis report on innovation</b>	EN	Hard copy and electronic format (word + pdf)
4. <b>27 Country Reports on the achievements of Cohesion Policy</b>	EN	Hard copy and electronic format (word + pdf)
5. <b>Synthesis Report on the achievements of Cohesion Policy</b>	EN	Hard copy and electronic format (word + pdf)
6. <b>Executive summary of the two synthesis reports</b>	EN, FR, DE	Hard copy and electronic format (word + pdf)
7. <b>Presentation material</b> for each of the two synthesis reports, for the use of Commission services	EN	Electronic format (PowerPoint)
8. <b>Two one-day meetings of the Expert Evaluation Network</b>		
9. <b>Progress reports</b>	EN	Monthly, when no other deliverable
10. <b>Presentation to Member States</b>	EN	To be decided later before the end of the contract

### 3.3.3 DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE COMMISSION

#### Programmes per country

	NSRF 2007-2013	NSR 2009	Operational Programmes				
			Obj 1	Obj 2	Mixed Obj 1 & Obj 2	Obj 3	Total
BE	1	nr	1	3		7	11
BG	1	1	5			3	8
CZ	1	1	12	1	2	6	21
DK	1	1		1		6	7
DE	1	nr	7	11		19	37
EE	1	1	2			3	5
IE	1	1		2		6	8
GR	1	1	8		2	5	15
ES	1	1	9	11	4	6	30
FR	1	nr	4	26	1	17	48
IT	1	1	12	16		11	39
CY	1	1		1	1	2	4
LV	1	1	2			4	6
LT	1	1	2			4	6
LU	1	nr		1		2	3
HU	1	1	11	1	1	6	19
MT	1	1	1			2	3
NL	1	1		4		6	10
AT	1	1	1	8		10	19
PL	1	1	20			9	29
PT	1	1	6	2	2	5	15
RO	1	1	5			3	8
SI	1	nr	2			7	9
SK	1	1	7	1	1	6	15
FI	1	1		5		5	10
SE	1	1		8		9	17
UK	1	1	3	12		11	26
Total	27	22	120	114	14	180	428

Note: nr stands for not received

The table above summarises for each country the programmes implemented under Objective 1 (Convergence) and Objective 2 (Competitiveness and Employment) during the period 2007–2013. The table also includes for each country the number of Objective 3 (Territorial Cooperation) programmes in which it is involved. For each of the 249 Objective 1 and 2 programmes and the 71 Objective 3 programmes, the Commission has transmitted:

- the Operational Programme
- the Ex ante Evaluation
- the Annual Report 2008

For all countries the national strategic reference framework 2007–2013 has been transmitted and for most of them the National Strategic Report for 2009.

In a few cases, on going evaluations are also available.

The core team has disseminated these documents to the national experts.

The expert network will also have access to the EVALSED Library<sup>7</sup> structured by country (27 items + other), theme (17 items +other) and method (7 main items). Interesting evaluations identified by the national experts will be include in the EVALSED Library.

---

<sup>7</sup> At current the Library is not yet accessible.



### Estimate of number of expert days per country

Country	Expert	Task 1	Task 2	Task3	Total
BE	Lydia Greunz	7	20	3	30
BG	Ruslan Stefanov	7	20	3	30
CZ	Jiří Blažek	8	29	3	40
DK	Peter Plougmann	6	16	3	25
DE	Oliver Schwab	12	45	3	60
EE	Tarmo Kalvet	5	12	3	20
IE	Patrick Drudy	6	16	3	25
EL	Lena Tsipuri	7	25	3	35
ES	Andres Faina	12	50	3	65
FR	Michel Lacave	12	50	3	65
IT	Andrea Naldini	12	45	3	60
CY	Lena Tsipuri	4	8	3	15
LV	Alf Vanags	5	12	3	20
LT	Alf Vanags	5	12	3	20
LU	Mathieu Lacave	4	8	3	15
HU	Attila Bartha	8	29	3	40
MT	Andrea Naldini	5	12	3	20
NL	Lourens Broersma	7	25	3	35
AT	Andreas Resch	7	25	3	35
PL	Grzegorz Gorzela	12	50	3	65
PT	Heitor Gomes	8	29	3	40
RO	Marina Ranga	7	20	3	30
SI	Damjan Kavas	5	12	3	20
SK	Karol Frank	7	20	3	30
FI	Seppo Laakso	7	20	3	30
SE	Hans Sundwall	7	20	3	30
UK	Pete Tyler	10	37	3	50

The number of days allocated to each expert is indicative and will be adjusted if and as necessary during the performance of the contract. The breakdown between Tasks 1 and 2 is also indicative since part of the work, which is common to both tasks, cannot be satisfactorily attributed to the two separate tasks.

## 4 ANNEX 1 – TEMPLATE “POLICY PAPER ON INNOVATION”

  ISMERI EUROPA	
<p><b>EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK</b> <b>DELIVERING POLICY ANALYSIS ON THE</b> <b>PERFORMANCE OF COHESION POLICY 2007-2013</b></p> <p><b>Task 1: POLICY PAPER ON INNOVATION</b></p> <p><b>[COUNTRY]</b></p> <p><b>VERSION: [DRAFT FOR COMMENTS/FINAL]</b> <b>DATE: [DD MM YEAR]</b></p> <p><b>[NAME OF EXPERT/S]</b> <b>[ORGANISATION]</b></p> <p><b>A report to the European Commission</b> <b>Directorate-General Regional Policy</b></p>	

---

## CONTENTS

<b>PREAMBLE AND GUIDELINES FOR EXPERTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL INNOVATION POLICY AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF ERDF .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL INNOVATION POLICY.....	5
2.2 ERDF CONTRIBUTION ACROSS POLICY AREAS .....	5
<b>3 EVIDENCE AVAILABLE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF INNOVATION MEASURES CO-FINANCED BY ERDF .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER THE CONVERGENCE OBJECTIVE.....	6
3.2 ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER THE COMPETITIVENESS OBJECTIVE .....	6
<b>CONCLUSION: MAIN CHALLENGES FACED BY COHESION POLICY PROGRAMMES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ANNEX A - BACKGROUND DATA ON EU COHESION POLICY SUPPORT TO INNOVATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>ANNEX B - CLASSIFICATION OF INNOVATION POLICY AREAS, INSTRUMENTS AND BENEFICIARIES.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ANNEX C - CATEGORISATION OF EXPENDITURE TO BE USED FOR CALCULATING EU COHESION POLICY RESOURCES DEVOTED TO INNOVATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>

---

## PREAMBLE AND GUIDELINES FOR EXPERTS

This note outlines the required content of the policy papers on innovation. The main objectives of the papers are to:

- Summarise national and regional innovation policies and the relationship between the two
- Indicate the contribution of the ERDF to innovation policy
- Outline any evidence on the achievements of the ERDF
- Indicate the challenges for innovation policy that need to be tackled.

The policy reports should adopt a broad definition of innovation, corresponding to that included in the third edition of the Oslo Manual. An innovation is, therefore, the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service) or process, a new marketing method, or a new organisational method<sup>8</sup>.

The definition should be adapted as necessary to the national context. In practice, innovation should cover projects and measures defined as Research and Technological Innovation (RTI) in the classification of the expenditure co-financed by to the ERDF. The specific areas of intervention, the measures used and the recipients of funding are listed in Annex B below.

In the report, a distinction should be made throughout between regions receiving different types of assistance, in particular, under the Convergence Objective, the Competitiveness and Employment Objective and the Regional Cooperation Objective.

The primary sources of information for preparing the papers for each of the Member States are:

1) The official documents and the evaluations:

- Annual Implementation Reports and in particular those for 2008 and 2009<sup>9</sup>
- OPs on Convergence, Competitiveness and Employment, Territorial Cooperation
- Ex ante evaluations
- NSRFs, 2007-2013
- National Strategic Report 2009

2) Statistical information collected by the core team:

- Financial data by main policy area

3) Evaluation evidence available in the Member States:

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information see: OECD (2005), investment in new transport infrastructure and improvements of existing network, including intermodal facilities 'Oslo Manual', Guidelines for collecting, and interpreting innovation data", third edition, a joint publication of OECD and Eurostat.

<sup>9</sup> Available in July 2010.

- Ongoing evaluations undertaken by national authorities (evaluations launched and produced in the 2007–2013 period and evaluations relating to 2000–2006 expenditure which may be relevant for similar interventions continuing in 2007–2013)
- Other research, studies, impact assessments available within Member States
- Information and data from interviews

Helpful information and in particular the results of the ex post evaluation 2000–2006 are available at the DG Regional Policy web-site: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2_en.htm)

Additional or more detailed information might be obtained by interviewing relevant people in managing authorities and other relevant bodies.

Experts should highlight good evaluation reports and examples of evaluations of innovation policy which exemplify good practice.

The report is intended to be up to 10 pages in length, depending on the size of the country not including annexes. The suggested number of pages per section is indicated below.

To ensure transparency, experts should indicate below any evaluations or official studies that they have worked on, or are working on, in their particular countries.

## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[Max. 1 page]

This synthesis should give a concise account of the role of ERDF in national and regional innovation policy. Moreover, it will summarise the main results to date of innovation intervention co-financed by EU Cohesion Policy and the main challenges faced by Cohesion Policy programmes.

## 2 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL INNOVATION POLICY AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF ERDF

[Max. 3 pages]

### 2.1 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL INNOVATION POLICY

A brief outline of the main features of national innovation policy and how regional innovation policy relates to this

- What are the main features of national innovation strategy in terms of objectives and policy measures?
- How is the national strategy translated into policy at the regional level – i.e. what are the main objectives in each types of region receiving assistance?
- Is there a regional dimension to innovation policies, in the sense of regions having their own specific policies which are distinct from the national policy?

#### *Role of ERDF*

Data on ERDF resources allocated to innovation policy by programme has been set out by the core team in Table 1 of Annex A.

Experts should indicate in the table (in the final column) the main measures planned or being undertaken under the different programmes (in the case of the regional programmes, aggregated by Objective) and outline their content and purpose

### 2.2 ERDF CONTRIBUTION ACROSS POLICY AREAS

Data on ERDF resources allocated by policy area have been set out by the core team in Table 2 of Annex A.

Experts should comment on the distribution of ERDF support by policy area, distinguishing between convergence and competitiveness objectives, if applicable. Experts should make use of any qualitative information available when doing this.

***Relevant questions include:***

- What is the main focus of support of the ERDF?
- What are the main measures used and who are the main recipients of funding?
- How coherent is the focus of support and the types of measure supported with national and/or regional policy?
- Does any of the financial assistance provided by the ERDF go to supporting inter-regional cooperation in respect of innovation policy? If so, please outline the form this takes, its purpose and relative importance.

### **3 EVIDENCE AVAILABLE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF INNOVATION MEASURES CO-FINANCED BY ERDF**

*[Max. 4 pages]*

Experts should synthesise any evidence available on outputs and results of the innovation measures co-financed by the ERDF, noting where relevant evidence on the performance of innovation policy in general (i.e. which is not co-financed by the ERDF) at either regional or national level. They should indicate how outcomes and results relate to the objectives of policy and any targets set. Again, experts should not limit their analysis to quantitative information only but also make use of qualitative information.

#### **3.1 ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER THE CONVERGENCE OBJECTIVE**

Experts should collect the evidence available on achievements of innovation initiatives co-financed by the ERDF from AIR, evaluations and other relevant studies.

For the following policy areas:

- Innovation friendly environment
- Knowledge transfer and support to innovation poles and clusters
- Boosting applied research and product development

Please answer the following questions:

- What policy initiatives co-financed by the ERDF have been launched in this area?
- What is the expenditure incurred in relation to the funding allocated?
- What a) output and b) results have been achieved?

#### **3.2 ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER THE COMPETITIVENESS OBJECTIVE**

The same questions as above

## CONCLUSION: MAIN CHALLENGES FACED BY COHESION POLICY PROGRAMMES

*[Max. 2 pages]*

Expert should summarise the main conclusions of the above analysis. In doing so, they should provide answers to the following questions (where possible from national reports and other evidence and where not from their personal assessment):

- What is the contribution of the ERDF in innovation policy?
- What evidence exists on outcomes and results from ERDF co-financed programmes? What are the main achievements so far?
- Is the innovation policy being followed and the focus of ERDF support appropriate in the different regions receiving assistance?
- What are the main challenges which need to be overcome in the future for policy to be effective?



## REFERENCES

Within the list of references, experts should highlight those studies and evaluations which exemplify good practice.

## ANNEX A – BACKGROUND DATA ON EU COHESION POLICY SUPPORT TO INNOVATION

The data on the ERDF resources allocated cover the FOI codes defined as being relevant for support of RTDI, or, more precisely, those that cover the bulk of resources devoted to innovation (see annex B for the list of codes). Experts should assess the appropriateness of this common definition and, if necessary, adjust the coverage to the national case in consultation with the core team. Note: experts should complete the final column only in respect of the National and Regional programmes totals and not for each regional programme.

**Table 1 – Total ERDF resources allocated per programme (2007–2013)**

Programmes	Total ERDF resources for innovation	Innovation support as % of total ERDF	Main initiatives* being undertaken or implemented
National/Multi-regional programme	To be provided by the core team	To be provided by the core team	To be completed by the expert
Regional programmes			-----
..			-----
...			-----
...			-----
<i>Total Convergence Obj.</i>			To be completed by experts
<i>Total Competitiveness Obj.</i>			To be completed by expert
<i>Total country</i>			

\* The term initiatives should be understood in a wide sense covering measures, projects, actions and so on co-financed by the ERDF. Among these, experts should identify the main kinds of intervention.  
Source: core team on EC data.

As in the case of Table 1, experts may suggest a wider or narrower coverage of innovation in Table 2 than that defined here, which would imply adding or subtracting particular FOI codes. In this case, experts should consult the core team to explain their reasons for so doing.

Table 2 - ERDF contribution to innovation by policy area (2007-2013)

*a - Convergence Objective*

Policy area	Categorisation of expenditure (corresponding FOI codes)	Total ERFD	%	
			Regional share	National share
Innovation friendly environment	05			
	11			
	12			
	13			
	14			
	15			
Knowledge transfer and support to innovation poles and clusters	74			
	02			
	03			
	04			
Boosting applied research and product development	01			
	06			
	07			
	09			

Source: core team on EC data.

***b – Competitiveness and Employment Objective***

Policy area	Categorisation of expenditure (corresponding FOI codes)	Total ERFD	%	
			Regional share	National share
Innovation friendly environment	05			
	11			
	12			
	13			
	14			
	15			
Knowledge transfer and support to innovation poles and clusters	74			
	02			
	03			
Boosting applied research and product development	04			
	01			
	06			
	07			
	09			

Source: core team on EC data.

## ANNEX B – CLASSIFICATION OF INNOVATION POLICY AREAS, INSTRUMENTS AND BENEFICIARIES

Policy area	Short description
Innovation friendly environment	<p>This category covers a range of actions which seek to improve the overall environment in which enterprises innovate, and notably three sub groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• innovation financing (in terms of establishing financial engineering schemes, etc.);</li> <li>• regulatory improvements and innovative approaches to public services and procurement (this category could notably capture certain e-government investments related to provision of services to enterprises);</li> <li>• Developing human capital for the knowledge economy. This category will be limited to projects in higher education aimed at developing industry orientated courses and post-graduate courses; training of researchers in enterprises or research centres.</li> </ul> <p>The category also covers initiatives geared towards improving governance capacities for innovation and knowledge policies (e.g. specific technical assistance funding, support for regional foresight)</p>
Knowledge transfer and support to innovation poles and clusters	<p>Direct or indirect support for knowledge and technology transfer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct support: aid scheme for utilising technology-related services or for implementing technology transfer projects, notably environmentally friendly technologies and ITC;</li> <li>• indirect support: delivered through funding of infrastructure and services of technology parks, innovation centres, university liaison and transfer offices, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Direct or indirect support for creation of poles (involving public and non-profit organisations as well as enterprises) and clusters of companies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct support: funding for enterprise level cluster activities, etc.</li> <li>• indirect support through funding for regrouping R&amp;D infrastructure in poles, infrastructure for clusters, etc.</li> </ul>
Boosting applied research and product development	<p>Funding of “Pre-competitive development” and “Industrial research” projects and related infrastructure. Policy instruments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• aid schemes for single beneficiary or groups of beneficiaries (including IPR protection and exploitation);</li> <li>• research infrastructures for non-profit/public organisations and higher education sector directly related to universities.</li> </ul> <p>Any direct or indirect support for the creation of innovative enterprises (spin-offs and start-ups)</p>

<b>Instruments</b>	<b>Short description</b>
Infrastructures and facilities	Building and equipment for laboratories or facilities for university or research centres, Telecommunication infrastructures, Building and equipment for incubators and parks for innovative enterprises
Aid schemes	Grants and loans for RTDI projects Innovative finance (venture capital, equity finance, special bonds, etc.) for innovative enterprises
Education and training	Graduate and post-graduate University courses Training of researchers

<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Short description</b>
Public sectors	Universities National research institutions and other national and local public bodies (innovation agencies, BIC, Chambers of Commerce, etc..) Public companies
Private sectors	Enterprises Private research centres
Others	NGOs
Networks	cooperation between research, universities and businesses cooperation between businesses (clusters of SMEs) other forms of cooperation among different actors

## ANNEX C – CATEGORISATION OF EXPENDITURE TO BE USED FOR CALCULATING EU COHESION POLICY RESOURCES DEVOTED TO INNOVATION

FOI Code	Priority Theme
	<b>Research and technological development (RTD), innovation and entrepreneurship</b>
01	R&TD activities in research centres
02	R&TD infrastructure (including physical plant, instrumentation and high-speed computer networks linking research centres) and centres of competence in a specific technology
03	Technology transfer and improvement of cooperation networks between small businesses (SMEs), between these and other businesses and universities, postsecondary education establishments of all kinds, regional authorities, research centres and scientific and technological poles (scientific and technological parks, technopoles, etc.)
04	Assistance to R&TD, particularly in SMEs (including access to R&TD services in research centres)
05	Advanced support services for firms and groups of firms
06	Assistance to SMEs for the promotion of environmentally-friendly products and production processes (introduction of effective environment managing system, adoption and use of pollution prevention technologies, integration of clean technologies into firm production)
07	Investment in firms directly linked to research and innovation (innovative technologies, establishment of new firms by universities, existing R&TD centres and firms, etc.)
09	Other measures to stimulate research and innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs
	<b>Information society</b>
11	Information and communication technologies (access, security, interoperability, risk-prevention, research, innovation, e-content, etc.)
12	Information and communication technologies (TEN-ICT)
13	Services and applications for the citizen (e-health, e-government, e-learning, e-inclusion, etc.)
14	Services and applications for SMEs (e-commerce, education and training, networking, etc.)
15	Other measures for improving access to and efficient use of ICT by SMEs
	<b>Human capital</b>
74	Developing human potential in the field of research and innovation, in particular through post-graduate studies and training of researchers, and networking activities between universities, research centres and businesses

## 5 ANNEX 2 – TEMPLATE “COUNTRY REPORT ON ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY”

  ISMERI EUROPA	
<p><b>EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK DELIVERING POLICY ANALYSIS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF COHESION POLICY 2007–2013</b></p> <p><b>TASK 2: COUNTRY REPORT ON ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY</b></p> <p><b>[COUNTRY]</b></p> <p><b>VERSION: [DRAFT FOR COMMENTS/FINAL] DATE: [DD MM YEAR]</b></p> <p><b>[NAME OF EXPERT/S] [ORGANISATION]</b></p> <p><b>A REPORT TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION DIRECTORATE–GENERAL REGIONAL POLICY</b></p>	

This template is provisional and will be adapted if necessary after it has been tested on the policy study for Austria.



## Contents

PREAMBLE AND GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL EXPERTS .....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
SECTION 1 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT.....	5
SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED.....	5
SECTION 3 – IMPLEMENTATION .....	6
SECTION 4– ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES .....	7
SECTION 5 – EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION .....	9
SECTION 6 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION .....	9
SECTION 7 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES .....	10
REFERENCES .....	11
INTERVIEWS.....	11

---

## PREAMBLE AND GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL EXPERTS

This note outlines the required content of the country reports. These reports have two main aims:

- to assess the performance of the regional development programmes supported by EU funding in assisted regions in terms of their output, results and wider effects (or impact) in strengthening the economies concerned in relation to stated policy objectives and concrete targets set
- to summarise the findings of the evaluations undertaken, comment on methods applied and draw attention to examples of good practice in this regard.

Essentially, therefore, the task is a stock-taking exercise, the purpose of which is to present in a succinct way the evidence available on the progress made in implementing Cohesion Policy in Member States across the EU, the achievements and the problems which have arisen or are arising. At the same time, the concern is to put Cohesion Policy into perspective in relation to the overall regional development strategy being undertaken across the country and the other sources of finance being used to implement this as well as the changing economic and social context.

A distinction should be made throughout between the different types of regions receiving assistance – i.e. those receiving funding under, respectively, the Convergence Objective, the Competitiveness and Employment Objective and the Territorial Cooperation Objective.

The primary sources of information for preparing the report for each of the Member States are:

1) The official documents and the evaluations<sup>10</sup>:

- Annual Implementation Reports and in particular those for 2008 and 2009<sup>11</sup>
- OPs on Convergence, Competitiveness and Employment, Territorial Cooperation
- Ex ante evaluations
- NSRFs, 2007–2013
- National Strategic Report 2009

2) Statistical information collected by the core team:

- Summary data on socio-economic by region (Eurostat)
- Indicators of national macroeconomic context (Eurostat)
- Financial data by main policy area

3) Evaluation evidence available in the Member States and collected by the experts:

---

<sup>10</sup> A CD with these documents will be transmitted to the expert at the First Expert Meeting on 5 March 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Available in July 2010.

- Ongoing evaluations undertaken by national authorities (evaluations launched and produced in the 2007–2013 period and evaluations relating to 2000–2006 expenditure which may be relevant for similar interventions continuing in 2007–2013)
- Other research, studies, impact assessments available within Member States
- Information and data from interviews with selected managing authorities
- Regional data beyond 2007

Additional helpful information and in particular the results of the ex post evaluation 2000–2006 are available at the DG REGIO web-site: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2_en.htm)

In order to complete the report, experts will need to contact and interview managing authorities and other relevant people in order to obtain additional information, or more detailed information than is published, about the outcome of expenditure, the difficulties encountered and any changes to the published plans as well as about the evaluation process and how this is working in practice, including about evaluations currently underway.

The report is intended to be a maximum of 30 pages in length for the larger countries, not including annexes, which means that it should concentrate on the main aspects of policy and the main programmes implemented in the different regions. The suggested number of page per section is shown in the table below:

	Number of pages
Executive summary	1
1) Socio-economic context	1-2
2) The regional development policy pursued	1-2
3) Implementation	2-3
4) Achievements	6-12
5) Effects of intervention	1-2
6) Evaluations and good practices	3-6
7) Concluding remarks - future challenges	1-2
Total	16-30

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[1 page]

### SECTION 1 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

[1-2 pages]

*The aim of this section is to outline the socio-economic situation in the country and the nature and scale of regional development problems and how both of these are tending to change over time, especially in response to the global economic recession and the policies adopted for tackling it. The purpose is to help to interpret Cohesion Policy evidence.*

Table 1 sets out summary statistics on major features of different regions and of Convergence and Competitiveness and Employment regions in relation to both the EU27 and country averages. The statistics cover population, GDP, employment and indicators of underlying strengths and weaknesses (education attainment levels of working-age population, division of employment between broad sectors and R&D expenditure). Table 2 summarises the main macroeconomic features and how these have changed in recent years. Please add more recent data from national sources if they are available and relevant for indicating later regional developments.

On the basis of these tables and your knowledge, please briefly answer the following questions:

- What are the main features of regional disparities in the country? What are the main factors underlying these disparities (such as differences in infrastructure endowment, accessibility and the extent of agglomeration) and to what extent have they tended to become more or less important over the recent past?
- Has the global recession or the measures taken in response to it led to any widening of the differences in these underlying factors?
- How did the macroeconomic context affect regional development and regional development policy over this period? (e.g. was policy constrained by the global recession? Was there a shift in policy priorities?)

[Annex: Table 1: Regional disparities and trends 2000–2009, Table 2: Macro-economic developments 2000–2009]

### SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED

[1-2 pages]

*The purpose of this section is to summarise the content of regional development policy in the country in terms of its focus and how it relates to the main development problems.*

Table 3 indicates the breakdown of financial allocation by main policy area under the different Objectives. On the basis of Table 3, the other sources of information listed in the guidelines and your knowledge please answer the following questions:

- What are the main priorities of regional development policy in the country over the period 2007–2013 in the different Objective regions? To what extent have they been modified since the programming period began? Have economic developments, such as in particular, the global recession and the response to it, led to any such modification?
- How far does the financial allocation both between and within policy areas reflect the stated objectives of policy? To what extent is funding concentrated in the regions with the most serious problems?
- How far is the focus of EU support consistent with, or complementary to, national or regional development policy?

[Annex: Table 3: Financial allocation by main policy area]

## SECTION 3 – IMPLEMENTATION

[2–3 pages]

*The concern of this section is to examine the implementation process and the expenditure incurred in the different policy areas under the different Objectives as compared with the funding allocated, in order to identify potential problems of absorbing the funding made available.*

Table 4 indicates the latest data on disbursements broken down by main policy area. On the basis of the information in Table 4, the other sources of information other sources of information listed in the guidelines and your knowledge, please answer the following questions:

- To the extent that expenditure falls significantly short of what was allocated given the time which has elapsed since the programming period began, what are the main reasons for this (e.g. delays in initiating projects or problems in implementing programmes)?
- Has the allocation of expenditure between policy areas been modified since it was initially decided? If so, what are the underlying reasons?
- To what extent have unfavourable economic circumstances adversely affected the implementation of Cohesion Policy?

[Annex: Table 4: Disbursements by main policy area]

## SECTION 4- ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES

[6-12 pages]

*The purpose of this section is to assess and summarise the achievements of the policy implemented so far in the different policy areas in relation, wherever possible, to quantitative targets set or stated objectives and in the context of the regional and national developments summarised in Section 1 above. The analysis in this section should in particular draw on the Annual Implementation report for 2009 and the evaluation evidence available in the Member states (for the period 2007-2013 but also for the 2000-2006 period where relevant for continuing projects) including interviews. The assessment needs to look at both quantitative evidence (main indicators of output, results – and impact if available) and qualitative evidence (achievements which are not directly quantifiable or where the quantitative evidence gives only a partial indication of developments).*

For **each of the policy areas** below, please answer the following set of questions:

- What are the main outputs and results? Please include qualitative as well as quantitative information on achievements?
- How do output, results and other achievements compare with the targets set or with stated policy objectives?
- To the extent that output, results and other achievements diverge from the targets or objectives set (either exceeding or falling short of them), what are the main reasons for this (such as the economic situation not turning out to be as initially assumed)?
- Are there any examples emerging from the analysis of achievements that that could be regarded as good practice? Please describe.

Please indicate the main achievements of the policy and include quantitative indicators of these if referred to in the Annual Implementation reports 2009 or evaluation documents. The domains listed under each head are intended to give an indication of the kinds of issue to cover but they are far from being exhaustive.

### **Policy areas (provisional list):**

#### **Enterprise support, including assistance to large firms, SMEs and handicrafts, RTDI**

Possible achievements in, for example:

- support of traditional activities, development of new activities, measures to attract foreign investment
- support of private and/or public R&D and innovation capacity, creation or strengthening of links between businesses and the research community, increase or accelerate technology diffusion, creation or expansion of centres of excellence, 'poles of competitiveness'

- strengthening of SMEs, support for creation of new businesses, support to clusters of specialisation, attempts to 'lever' private funds and involve financial intermediaries in providing development support, development of support and advisory services

**Human Resources (Note: most of the intervention under this head is financed by the European Social Fund and this should not be included in the policies being assessed, except where relevant to assessing the effects of ERDF and CF, which are centred on providing support for fixed investment in this area)**

Possible achievements in, for example:

- strengthening of human capital and skills of the work force
- promotion of equal opportunities and integration of migrants into society

#### **Transport and telecommunications**

Possible achievements in, for example:

- investment in new transport infrastructure and improvements in existing network, including in urban transport and intermodal links (road, rail, waterways, ports, airports)
- improvements in accessibility of remote areas to regional, national or international networks as a result of investment (reduced journey times, time savings)
- reductions in congestion on main routes or in urban centres and reduction in emissions
- investment in new or improved telecommunication networks and increased access to high-speed lines.

#### **Environment and energy**

Possible achievements in, for example:

- reduction in major environmental risks
- improvements in water reserves, waste disposal, recycling of waste
- compliance with international standards (e.g. EU Directives)
- elimination or reduction of sources of pollution
- increased energy saving
- development of renewable energy sources

#### **Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development)**

Possible achievements in, for example:

- the clean-up, reclamation, renovation, regeneration of urban and rural areas, old industrial sites, historical heritage sites
- support of local communities through investment in e.g. local (health, social, basic) services, cultural and sports facilities as well as economic activities
- support of diversification of activities and their sustainability through aid, for example, to the development of tourism and local handicrafts.

Other policy areas (please add if necessary)

## SECTION 5 – EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

[1-2 pages]

*The purpose of this section is to assess the wider effects of intervention in the light of economic developments in the country, as outlined in Section 1 above. The aim is to give an indication both of the possible contribution of intervention to these developments and of how the impact of intervention has been affected by them. Please draw on whatever evidence is available, in particular the results of evaluations and impact assessments, findings of research studies and information from interviews as well as recent statistical data. Given the relatively short time which has elapsed since the programming period began, it may well be difficult to identify significant effects but there might be signs of interventions having an influence on the potential for development.*

- What has been the contribution so far of the projects supported in the various policy areas to the development of regions assisted under the different Objectives? How far are there indications of intervention strengthening the capacity of the regions concerned to sustain economic development or improving the quality of life?
- Has the support provided from EU sources contributed to combating the global recession by reinforcing the response to this?
- Is there any evidence that EU support under Cohesion Policy is helping regions to respond to major long-term challenges (such as the increased competition resulting from globalisation, demographic change, climate change and energy security)?

## SECTION 6 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION

[3-6 pages]

*The purpose of this section is to summarise the results of evaluations undertaken, to assess and comment on the methods used and to identify good practice in evaluation. Examples of good practice and interesting approaches to evaluation should be identified so that they can be included in the EVALSED Library.*



### Evaluations

- Are evaluations coordinated by reference to some kind of plan or strategy?
- What evaluations and studies have been carried out in the country to assess Cohesion Policy performance, in particular during the programming period 2007–2013? Please provide a list or a table by type of evaluation (e.g. policy areas, priority axes, groups of action, major projects) and scope (e.g. across operational programmes at national level, within specific operational programmes).
- What are the main features of these evaluations? Please outline (1) the content and coverage, (2) method of evaluation, (3) main findings and recommendations.
- What is your assessment of the evaluations (e.g. pertinence and usefulness of results, methodological appropriateness, technical difficulty of carrying them out)?
- Are there examples of evaluations which have been, or are being, carried out which exemplify good practice and which should be included in the EVALSED Library? Please describe and give detailed references.
- What are the most important gaps in evaluation evidence and the evaluations being undertaken or planned?

### Setting of objectives

- Have meaningful targets been set in the different policy areas to help assess the performance of programmes? Is monitoring providing adequate information on outcomes in different policy areas and the progress being made to achieving targets and wider objectives?
- Has there been a serious attempt to identify impact indicators of the effect of policy on regional development? If so, describe the indicators selected and comment on their relevance.

## SECTION 7 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES

[1–2 pages]

*The purpose of this section is to identify the main points to emerge from the above analysis and the main challenges which need to be overcome over the coming years.*

- What are the main conclusions to emerge from analysis of the pursuit of Cohesion Policy given economic developments in the country?
- What are the main achievements so far of Cohesion Policy support across regions? What are the main problems to be overcome?
- What are the main points to come out of the review of evaluations?

## REFERENCES

1. On going evaluations from Member States (please list by type of evaluation)
  - National-wide evaluations across operational programmes
  - Evaluations of specific operational programmes
  - Evaluations of specific aspects in operational programmes
2. Other research, studies, impact assessments available within Member States
3. Official planning and evaluation documents
4. Other references

## INTERVIEWS